

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**CEDRIC ANDREL GLAZE,**

CASE NO. 1:19 CV 2974

Petitioner,

v.

JUDGE JAMES R. KNEPP II

**WARDEN DONNIE MORGAN,**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND  
ORDER**

Respondent.

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Carmen E. Henderson's Report and Recommendation ("R&R") to deny and dismiss Petitioner Cedric Andrel Glaze's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and to deny Petitioner's other pending motions. (Doc. 22). As to the Petition, Judge Henderson recommends the Court deny and dismiss Ground One as partly procedurally defaulted, and partly non-cognizable; deny Grounds Two, Three, and Four as procedurally defaulted; dismiss Grounds Five and Six as non-cognizable; and dismiss Ground Seven as voluntarily withdrawn. *Id.* at 12-20. Further, Judge Henderson recommends the Court deny Petitioner's Motion for Leave to Amend (Doc. 9), Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 15), and Motion for Stay or Abeyance (Doc. 19). *Id.* at 20-31.

Under the relevant statute:

Within fourteen days of being served with a copy [of a Magistrate Judge's R&R], any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court. A judge of the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2). The failure to file timely written objections to a Magistrate Judge's R&R constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review by the district court

of any issues covered in the R&R. *Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813, 814-15 (6th Cir. 1984); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

In this case, the R&R was issued on January 18, 2022, and it is now February 15, 2022. Petitioner has neither filed objections nor requested an extension of time to file them. Despite the lack of objections, the Court has reviewed Judge Henderson R&R, and agrees with the findings and recommended rulings therein. Therefore, the Court ADOPTS Judge Henderson's R&R (Doc. 22) as the Order of this Court, and DENIES and DISMISSES Petitioner's Petition (Doc. 1); and DENIES Petitioner's Motion for Leave to Amend (Doc. 9), Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 15), and Motion for Stay or Abeyance (Doc. 19) as set forth therein.

The Court further finds an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). Further, because Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right directly related to his conviction or custody, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); FED. R. APP. P. 22(b); Rule 11 of Rules Governing § 2254 Cases.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ James R. Knepp II  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE